

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT BECKLEY**

GARLAND S. SLADE,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:21-cv-00314

DAVID L. YOUNG, *Warden*,
MS. ARVIZA, *Assistant Warden*,
MR. C. VENTURINO, *Retired Case Manager*,
MR. R. HEDRICK, *Unit Manager*,
MR. J. GROGAN, *Ex-Unit Counselor*,
MR. R. BOWYER, *Unit Counselor*,
MR. LILLY, *Case Manager*,
MR. TURNER, *Unit Counselor – from Different Unit*,

Respondents.

ORDER

Pending are Petitioner’s Application to Proceed without Prepayment of Fees or Costs [Doc. 1] and Complaint [Doc. 2], both filed May 24, 2021. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Omar J. Aboulhosn, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation (“PF&R”). Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn filed his PF&R on February 29, 2024. Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn recommended that the Court deny Petitioner’s Application to Proceed without Prepayment of Fees or Costs [Doc. 1], dismiss the Complaint [Doc. 2] without prejudice, and remove this matter from the docket.

The Court need not review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (“A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the


report or specified proposed findings or recommendations *to which objection is made.*” (emphasis added)). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner’s right to appeal the Court’s order. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also United States v. De Leon-Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (Parties may not typically “appeal a magistrate judge’s findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn’t require de novo review absent objection.”); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections in this case were due on March 18, 2024. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [**Doc. 7**], **DENIES** Petitioner’s Application to Proceed without Prepayment of Fees or Costs [**Doc. 1**], **DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** the Complaint [**Doc. 2**], and **DISMISSES** the matter.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: April 9, 2024




Frank W. Volk
United States District Judge